



**SCOTTSDALE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD
KIVA - CITY HALL
3939 N. DRINKWATER BOULEVARD
JULY 13, 2006
APPROVED 7-20-2006**

PRESENT: Betty Drake, Councilman
Jeremy A. Jones, Vice Chairman
Steven Steinberg, Commissioner
Michael Edwards, Design Member
Michael D'Andrea, Development Member
David Brantner, Development Member
Michael Schmitt, Design Member

STAFF: Lusia Galav
Don Hadder
Kira Wauwie
Jeff Ruenger
Mac Cummins
Dan Symer

CALL TO ORDER

The regular session of the Scottsdale Development Review Board was called to order by Councilwoman Drake at 1:03 p.m.

OPENING STATEMENT

Councilwoman Drake read the opening statement that describes the role of the Development Review Board and the procedures used in conducting this meeting.

ROLL CALL

A formal roll call was conducted confirming members present as stated above.

Councilwoman Drake welcomed Michael Edwards to the Board.

MINUTES APPROVAL

2. June 15, 2006 Development Review Board Study Session Minutes
3. June 15, 2006 Development Review Board Regular Meeting Minutes

VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED TO APPROVE THE JUNE 15, 2006 MINUTES OF THE DEVELOPMENT REVIEW BOARD, INCLUDING THE STUDY SESSION. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

CONSENT AGENDA

4. 68-DR-2000#4 Lot 22 @ Perimeter Center - DHL Campus
5. 69-DR-2000#3 Chase Bank
6. 6-PP-2004#2 Boulders Villas
7. 12-DR-2004#2 Boulders Villas
8. 81-DR-2005#2 FirstBank Branch @ Frys Shopping Center
9. 84-DR-2005 Silo Urbis 77 (Silo Urban Homes)
14. 53-DR-2006 SGA Hangars

VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF 68-DR-2000#4, 69-DR-2000#3, 6-PP-2004#2, 12-DR-2004#2, 81-DR-2005#2, 84-DR-2005, AND 53-DR-2006. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER BRANTNER, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

REGULAR AGENDA

10. 112-DR-2005 Atrium 7700

Mr. Symer addressed the Board. Highlights of his presentation included an aerial photo, site plan, landscape plan, and elevations. He noted that the proposed plan would reduce the existing structure to 16 units and provide additional landscaping, as well as additional parking and retention.

Mr. Duane Hyatt with Designlab Architects addressed the Board.

Vice-Chairman Jones stated that after studying the plans further he no longer had the same questions presented during study session.

Board Member D'Andrea commented that the Applicant had an opportunity to do something beneficial and to add to the existing project. He inquired concerning the placement of the tower elements. Mr. Hyatt described how adding the tower elements not only accented the exterior of the buildings but allowed for a variation in ceiling height and added light within the individual units.

Board Member D'Andrea stated that he was having difficulty making a connection between the floor plan and the elevations. Mr. Hyatt reviewed the plans, explaining that the buildings would be taken from the original four units per building to three. He described the interior layout of each unit, noting that the windows are 8 feet high. Each cluster of buildings will be oriented to a courtyard. Board Member D'Andrea commented that he understood that remodels were difficult, but he was having trouble reading the building elevations.

Vice-Chairman Jones remarked that a three dimensional study would have been beneficial. He opined that more landscaping should be used within the central courtyard surrounding the pool area, in order to provide a nicer view from the apartments surrounding that area. In response to a comment by Vice-Chairman Jones regarding the long narrow windows, Mr. Hyatt explained that the windows provide as much light as a wider window would because of the height; creating wide windows would have been intrusive on the structure of the building.

Vice-Chairman Jones concluded that the project was an improvement and that it had been difficult to understand, partially due to the unique nature of the project. Mr. Hyatt reiterated that the goal was to create something that would not resemble the existing project.

Commissioner Steinberg suggested adding or changing the materials and possibly using glass on the street elevations in order to create a less industrial feel.

Councilwoman Drake opined that a nice job had been done with the tower details and landscaping creating an overall pleasing effect.

Board Member Brantner opined that the proposed colors would not make a positive impact on the project. He requested that the Applicant reevaluate the colors and select something more exciting.

Board Member Schmitt commented that the color palette being presented would not update the appearance of the building. He suggested moving from the pastel shades towards something bolder.

VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED TO APPROVE CASE NUMBER 10, 112-DR-2005, WITH THE STIPULATION THAT THE ARCHITECT HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO FURTHER CONSIDER COLORS THAT MIGHT BE MORE EMPHATIC; TO WORK WITH STAFF WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE COLORS AS THEY ARE WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE.

Vice-Chairman Jones commented that with the Mediterranean scheme there was an improvement over what was existing and he found the project acceptable.

BOARD MEMBER SCHMITT SECONDED THE MOTION.

In response to a request by Councilwoman Drake, Vice-Chairman Jones clarified that by using the word "emphatic," he was reiterating the stance of the Board to accept more exciting colors than have been favored with past Boards. He noted that color choice could be considered separately with staff and if the Applicant

would prefer to stay with the current colors that would be acceptable; approval is not contingent on the color palette.

**THE MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF FIVE (5) TO TWO (2).
COMMISSIONER STEINBERG AND BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA
DISSENTED.**

11. 34-DR-2006 Paseo Village Remodel

Mr. Ruenger addressed the Board. Highlights of his presentation included an aerial photo, site plan, and zoning plan. Mr. Ruenger noted that the Applicant submitted revised plans reflecting a response to Board comments during an earlier study session.

Councilwoman Drake commented that she saw no response to the disruption of the pedestrian flow within the center and the introduction of cross-traffic into what is a pedestrian oriented neighborhood center. Mr. Gary Striyle with Architecture 3 explained that seat walls were placed along the sidewalk directing pedestrians towards the covered walkway in front of Walgreens. The sidewalk extending into the parking area to the median will be eight to ten feet wide.

Board Member D'Andrea stated that the comments given during the study session at the previous meeting were specific and he saw no improvements in the current application. The pedestrian circulation moving southeast on the site was dangerous and the vehicular circulation would present a problem with cars speeding through the parking lot, as well as a row of parking backing into the main drive entrance.

Board Member Schmitt expressed concern about the four lanes of traffic with an island for pedestrians. He opined that the proposed solution would be detrimental to that portion of the shopping center, noting that he would not support the application.

Councilwoman Drake opined that the shopping center had potential to be a real town center for McCormick Ranch and that introducing a suburban drive-through in the middle of the center would be a step backwards; putting in a Walgreens super store and a drive-through bank will destroy the possibility of the center becoming a community commercial center. She noted the pedestrian question raised during study session was not addressed, and she would not be supporting the application.

BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA MOVED TO CONTINUE CASE 34-DR-2006 IN ORDER TO ALLOW THE APPLICANT TO WORK ON IMPROVING THE PEDESTRIAN AND VEHICULAR CIRCULATION IN AND AROUND THAT PORTION OF THE SITE. SECONDED BY VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

12. 40-DR-2006 Nystrom Offices

Ms. Galav reviewed the stipulation challenges referred to in the project narrative. Staff had no objection to removing stipulation number 8, eliminating the landscaping in the rear of the building. Stipulation D requiring improvement with a minimum of 2.5 inches of asphalt over four inches of aggregate is a standard ordinance stipulation, however the parking lot is the responsibility of the homeowners association. The Applicant will re-stripe the parking lot to provide the required ADA spaces. Ms. Galav noted that the sanitation department approved an alternative approach to enclosing the refuse container.

VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF CASE 40-DR-2006 WITH REMOVAL OF STIPULATIONS 8 AND D. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

13. 41-DR-2006 Scottsdale Healthcare/Grayhawk Medical Office Building

Mr. Hadder addressed the Board. Highlights of his presentation included a context plan, aerial photo, site plan, landscape plan, and elevations. He noted the office building is located on the west side of the site as far from the neighboring residential area as possible and is also near a shopping center, discount tire center and the hospital currently under construction.

Mr. Hadder presented the west elevation, which was an area of concern for the Board. He noted that both spandrel and vision glass were used in that area and attachment 7 depicted a three-dimensional view.

Mr. Mike Brinkley with Scottsdale Healthcare addressed the Board. He reiterated the nature of the site forces an east/west facing building, noting that most of the element that looks like glass is used as a focal point and is made primarily of spandrel glass. If the question of thermal warming was not properly addressed they would be glad to make adjustments.

In response to a concern by Vice-Chairman Jones, Mr. Grigorescu with SWA Architects explained the rationale for the window design was to allow the wall to float out in front, and create a pocket for the window. Vice-Chairman Jones opined that the design would be more emphatic if either the dark material or something neutral were used so the wall would stand out in front of it. Mr. Grigorescu agreed to change the inset color to the darker shade.

Vice-Chairman Jones stated that dealing with western building exposures is a continuous concern in Arizona. There is a lot of appeal to having continuous glass bands, but with a long west exposure even when a majority of the area is spandrel it is necessary to examine the steps being taken to minimize impact of so much glass; there will be a large heat load for a building of this size. Vice-Chairman Jones remarked that if the sun angle studies only depicted the west elevation they are wrong, because the afternoon sun would not hit that portion of the building at 1:00 in the afternoon. Mr. Grigorescu stated that a software program was used to compute the sun movement for June 22, the longest day of the year, specific to the site and location.

A discussion ensued regarding the configuration of the windows and incorporation of the spandrel. Vice-Chairman Jones opined that many times during the year the sun angle is much lower than depicted and would be shining directly onto the west side. Overhangs would make almost no difference; the most effective strategy would be to use less glass. Mr. Grigorescu further explained the structure and insulation, noting that his goal was to create a sense of openness while maintaining the efficiency of the building. Vice-Chairman Jones opined that because other applicants have been allowed to use similar designs it would not be fair to deny the application. He stated that he would like to see better strategies used on the west sides of buildings.

Board Member D'Andrea commented on the fact that design cues were not taken from photographs of area buildings that were included in the packet. He expressed concern with the design of the building, the west-facing glass, the architectural detailing and the use of materials; he challenged the Applicant to take an overall look at the building, because it was lacking in design and materials and suggested additional landscaping be used to buffer the area along the west where the neighborhoods are located.

In response to a question by Board Member D'Andrea regarding 73rd Street, Mr. Hadder explained the plan is for the road to become a T road that will work off of the intersection and become a secondary road, with the main road being the connection to Scottsdale Road. The plan has been in place for a decade. Board Member D'Andrea reported that the vast majority of people using 73rd Street continue in a straight line. This is an opportunity to put in a roundabout or something similar which would create a safer road while coincidentally occurring right in front of the entrance to the building.

Board Member Edwards inquired why the techniques employed on the Thompson Peak Medical Office Building were not used in the design of this building. Mr. Brinkley stated that the goal was to improve on the design aspects and create something that would blend into the campus while not looking exactly the same. He reiterated that the math calculations for the sun evaluation would be reexamined.

Referring to Board Member D'Andrea's question about adding landscaping to buffer the neighborhoods, Mr. Brinkley explained that the Ordinance requires a five foot setback next to the houses and ten feet have been provided with the intention of installing trees. An open house was held with neighbors and all comments were positive.

In response to an inquiry by Commissioner Steinberg, Mr. Brinkley stated that there was nothing available depicting the context of the office building with the rest of the hospital campus. The colors were chosen to match the hospital. Commissioner Steinberg requested that if the Applicant is required to return to the Development Review Board, they bring something depicting the relationship of the Grayhawk Medical Office Building and the rest of the campus.

Vice-Chairman Jones commented that he could see the beginning of interesting design on the entry, but it needed more work. He reviewed positive and negative aspects of the entry design. Vice-Chairman Jones noted that part of the problem is Scottsdale Healthcare has set expectations for a certain standard of quality that has not been met with this project yet. Mr. Brinkley noted that one of the stipulations from staff was to redesign the entry element.

COMMISSIONER STEINBERG MOVED TO APPROVE 41-DR-2006. THE MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF A SECOND.

VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED TO CONTINUE CASE 41-DR-2006. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER D'ANDREA, THE MOTION CARRIED BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ONE (1). COMMISSIONER STEINBERG DISSENTED.

Councilwoman Drake commented in reviewing the landscape plan along the neighborhood side it appeared that trees had been placed there, she suggested a few more trees could be added to fill in the gaps.

15. 14-DR-2006 64th Street Reservoir - Security

Councilwoman Drake reminded the Board that there was a request for continuance on this case which involved several neighborhood groups and the City of Phoenix.

Vice-Chairman Jones suggested that along Thomas Road there may be an opportunity to have the existing barrier that is in the middle of the block turned into the recess between the two tanks, which may add some variety. This could create a landscape area or some visual relief along Thomas Road.

VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED TO CONTINUE CASE 14-DR-2006. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER SCHMITT, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

16. 17-DR-2006 68th Street & Thomas Road

Mr. Symer addressed the Board. Highlights of his presentation included a contextual aerial photo and a photo depiction of each corner of the intersection. He identified three primary key issues with the proposal: building orientation, setbacks to Thomas Road, and the location of the trash enclosure. It is the general policy of the City to encourage buildings to line up with the setback line adjacent to intersections in the urban environment in order to promote and enhance the human scale of development. Staff recommended denial of the application.

Mr. David Ross with Ross Design Group addressed the Board. He reviewed the history of the site and the various design changes that have been considered. Mr. Ross cited technical reasons for the current design and color choices and proposed placing landscaping around the trash enclosure. He noted that the individual archways and tower elements were used in order to mimic the Design Center style of architecture.

Board Member D'Andrea commented that he did not have a problem with the siting of the building, noting that staff brought to light some larger issues with the project that have not been properly addressed. Board Member D'Andrea pointed out that a traffic situation would be created with two-way traffic and parking working around the trash enclosure. He commented that the accent pediments are inconsistent and are not related to the use behind them and are inconsistent with the floor plan at the rear of the building.

Board Member Schmitt opined that the staff comments were accurate with respect to the siting and the project. The site does not support as many square feet as the design requires. He found it difficult to find aspects of the design that he would be in favor of; a better job could be done based on the comments of staff.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Ross, Board Member Schmitt stated that the Board no longer favors using archways as a pedestrian link.

Vice-Chairman Jones commended staff for doing an excellent job analyzing the project. He noted that the Design Center made good use of scale, simplicity, and relationship of materials and this project did not have the same scale; the building looks like a cheap version of the Design Center. He commented that the suggested landscaping could be very inconsistent. He noted that he would like to continue the case for further study.

Board Member Edwards agreed with the comments of staff, particularly the lack of relationship with the Design Center. Using stack stone in lieu of ceramic tile does not compare with the aesthetic of the Design Center; the wood porticos and arbors on the Design Center provide a nice pedestrian scale.

Councilwoman agreed with Board Member Edwards' comments regarding correlation with the Design Center; this project seems like a box with things stuck to it and shows no real consideration for pedestrian flow. She noted support for putting the building out toward the street and establishing a better landscape buffer. Neighborhood centers attract a lot of neighborhood and bicycle traffic which needs to be taken into consideration, especially in regards to the Dumpster placement and driveways.

Vice-Chairman Jones stated that he would be willing to move for a continuance in order to imply that work could be done in terms of the use of the site, the general amount of building, and moving the building out by the street.

VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED TO CONTINUE CASE 17-DR-2006 IN ORDER TO ALLOW THE APPLICANT TO RETHINK THE PROJECT. SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER STEINBERG, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SEVEN (7) TO ZERO (0).

17. 11-PP-2005 Arroya Bonita

Mr. Hadder addressed the Board. Presenting an aerial photo and a site plan of the area, he explained that the Rawhide wash runs from the northeast to the southwest through the property which provides a significant constraint and

determinant on how the subdivision is designed. He noted that elimination of the sewer pump stations of concern were identified by the Water Resources Department as a future project. Working with the Applicant will facilitate the ability to get a gravity sewer to replace the pump stations. Mr. Hadder reviewed the specifics of the project, noting that due to the Rawhide wash a large portion of the property has been designated as natural area open space. Staff recommended approval subject to the attached stipulations.

Board Member Brantner noted a conflict due to the fact that he was a resident in a neighboring community and recused himself from the case.

Mr. John Berry addressed the Board. He noted that he submitted four letters of non-opposition from the immediately adjacent neighbors. Mr. Berry reiterated that the Applicant had been working closely with the City to resolve the sewer issue and would be funding the installation of gravity sewer line three quarters of a mile to the south off site.

Mr. James Sorensen of 8627 Remuda Drive, representing the Rawhide Community Association, addressed the Board. He noted that the neighborhood was opposed to the 33-foot wide private access being used as the main access road into the neighborhood. He noted that when his subdivision was built the developers were not allowed to use that easement; they were forced to build a road.

Councilwoman Drake offered Mr. Helser another opportunity to speak, which he declined.

Mr. Berry thanked Mr. Sorensen for the generous amount of time he had devoted to discussions regarding granting an easement on his land for the sewer line; he has chosen not to cooperate with the City. Mr. Berry noted regarding the 33-foot easement that the issue of private access easements has not historically been the purview of the Development Review Board; the easement is the only legal access to the property. He stated that the land immediately to the west has been identified as Preserve land and no access would be granted through that area.

In response to a question by Commissioner Steinberg regarding extending the 33-foot access north to Jomax in the future, Mr. Hadder explained that a gap exists in the continuation; there is no expectation that access would ever be available.

In response to a question by Board Member Edwards regarding the new wall around Mr. Sorensen's property, Mr. Sorensen confirmed that the wall is along the edge of the easement.

VICE-CHAIRMAN JONES MOVED FOR APPROVAL OF CASE 11-PP-2005, ARROYA BONITA. SECONDED BY BOARD MEMBER SCHMITT, THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY A VOTE OF SIX (6) TO ZERO (0). BOARD MEMBER BRANTNER WAS RECUSED.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to discuss, Councilwoman Drake moved for adjournment at 3:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
AV-Tronics, Inc